DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 690 UD 016 959

AUTHOR Harvey, James J.; Hill, Paul T.
TITLE The NIE Compensatory Education Study: Evaluation for Decision-Making Purposes.
PUB DATE 8 Apr 77
NOTE 24p.; Prepared as a paper for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, N.Y., April 4-8, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; Compensatory Education Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Federal Programs; *Minority Group Children; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

This National Institute of Education (NIE) study of compensatory education, and evaluation of Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I is a response to congressional evaluation needs. The report traces the origin of Title I and the congressional interest in its evaluation. Prior efforts to assess the effectiveness of Title I, congressional reactions to these efforts, and the attempts of NIE to formulate an evaluation strategy by examining the fundamental purposes and effectiveness of compensatory education programs are discussed. Ways of identifying children in greatest need of compensatory education, determining alternate ways of meeting these children's needs, and considering the feasibility, costs, and consequences of alternative means of distributing federal compensatory education funds are also mentioned. (Author/BS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138690

7.19
E
U D

THE NIE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION STUDY: EVALUATION FOR DECISION-MAKING PURPOSES

JAMES J. HARVEY
PAUL T. HILL
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD016959

PREPARED FOR THE AERA ANNUAL MEETING, APRIL 4-8, 1977

THE NIE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION STUDY:

EVALUATION FOR DECISION-MAKING PURPOSES

We are here today to discuss NIE's study of compensatory education, and more specifically of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as a response to Congressional evaluation needs.

Before the other members of the panel describe individual studies which form a part of the overall evaluation, I want to spend a few minutes discussing the rationale for the evaluation approach we adopted. I want to do so because although the questions we are asking are in many ways familiar, the way in which we are trying to answer the questions is not.

As a background to this discussion, I want to first touch briefly upon the origins of Title I and Congressional interest in evaluation.

Then I will turn to some prior efforts to assess the effectiveness of Title I, and Congressional reaction to those efforts.

Finally, I will tell you of our own attempt to build an evaluation strategy incorporating the lessons we learned from those who went before us.

ORIGINS OF TITLE I OF ESEA

Looking first at the origins of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, most of you know that several political, social, and economic forces coalesced in 1965 to create an amazing variety of new

PROGRAMS AIMED AT CORRECTING SEVERAL DOMESTIC ILLS.

ONE RESULT OF THAT COALITION WAS THE ENACTMENT OF THE FIRST MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAM PROVIDING ASSISTANCE FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS AT THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY LEVEL, THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965. THE HISTORY OF THAT EVENT HAS BEEN AMPLY DOCUMENTED ELSEWHERE, SO I WILL TOUCH SIMPLY UPON A FEW OF ITS HIGHLIGHTS.[1]

AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR, ONE OF THE GREAT TENSIONS IN AMERICAN POLITICS WAS BETWEEN THE PROGRESSIVES IN BOTH MAJOR POLITICAL PARTIES, WHO SUPPORTED FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION AS A "GOOD THING", AND THE OPPONENTS OF FEDERAL EDUCATION AID, WHO FEARED FEDERAL DOMINATION OF THE SCHOOLS.

SUPPORTERS OF FEDERAL AID PUSHED SEVERAL SERIOUS ATTEMPTS FOLLOWING THE SECOND WORLD WAR TO ENACT A FEDERAL PROGRAM OF GENERAL AID TO EDUCATION, THAT IS, AID THAT COULD BE USED AT LOCAL DISCRETION FOR ANYTHING FROM EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, TO TEACHERS' SALARIES, TO CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION. BUT OPPOSITION WAS SO SEVERE THAT IT APPEARED DOUBTFUL AS LATE AS 1963 THAT ANY SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS WOULD BE FORTHCOMING FOR AT LEAST A DECADE.

ONE OF THE MAJOR FORCES OVERCOMING THIS OPPOSITION WAS COMPOSED OF ADVOCATES OF THE VIEW THAT SOCIETY HAD SPECIAL OBLIGATIONS TOWARD THE MOST VULNERABLE OF ITS CITIZENS, THE POOR.

SEVERAL INDIVIDUALS, INCLUDING MICHAEL HARRINGTON, PROVIDED VIVID DETAIL ON THE INCIDENCE OF POVERTY IN THE WELFARE STATE AND PROVOKED INTENSE DEBATE ABOUT THE APPROPRIATE PUBLIC RESPONSE TO THIS PARADOX. THEY MADE THE PUBLIC AND ITS OFFICIALS AWARE, IN HARRINGTON'S WORDS, THAT:

> ...TENS OF MILLIONS OF AMERICANS ARE, AT THIS VERY MOMENT, MAIMED IN BODY AND SPIRIT, EXISTING AT LEVELS BENEATH THOSE NECESSARY FOR HUMAN DECENCY.[2]

ONE OF THE DOMINANT THEMES OF THOSE CONCERNED WITH POVERTY BECAME THE DEBILITATING EFFECT THAT POVERTY HAD ON THE LIVES OF CHILDREN. IN 1968, GLAZER AND CREEDON EDITED A SERIES OF ARTICLES AND ESSAYS DEVOTED TO THE SUBJECT OF IMPOVERISHED CHILDREN.[3] MANY OF THE ARTICLES PRECEDED ENACTMENT OF ESEA, AND, IN FACT, SEVERAL OF THEM WERE FROM THE 1950's.

I WILL QUOTE EXTENSIVELY FROM THE DISCUSSION OF THESE TWO AUTHORS BECAUSE, IT SEEMS TO ME, THEIR VIEWS ARE AN EXCELLENT OUTLINE OF THE CONCERNS OF INFORMED POLICYMAKERS IN THE 1960's.

"THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD," THEY WROTE IS:

> EXPOSED TO MATERIAL...DEPRIVATIONS WHICH GENERATE A FEELING OF POWERLESSNESS. EVEN THOUGH POOR PARENTS MAY OFTEN HAVE HIGH ASPIRATIONS FOR THEIR CHILDREN, CONTRARY TO POPULAR BELIEF, THEY ALSO OFTEN BELIEVE THAT THEIR CHILDREN HAVE LITTLE CHANCE OF SUCCESS.

SCHOOLING, THEY POINTED OUT, APPEARED IRRELEVANT TO THE POOR. ON THE ONE HAND, MANY POOR CHILDREN DROPPED OUT OF SCHOOL BECAUSE OF FINANCIAL CRISES IN THE HOME. ON THE OTHER:

> IF THE POOR CHILD REMAINS IN SCHOOL, HE IS LIKELY TO HAVE THE LEAST EXPERIENCED TEACHERS. MANY OF THE LATTER HAVE LITTLE HOPE FOR THEIR STUDENTS, AND IN MANY CASES, ARE THEMSELVES DEMORALIZED BY THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THEY MUST TEACH. FOR THE NEGRO, THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN, AND THE PUERTO RICAN CHILD, THERE IS THE ADDITIONAL ONUS OF RACE PREJUDICE IN AND OUT OF THE CLASSROOM.

LYNDON JOHNSON, BY A STROKE OF POLITICAL GENIUS, MELDED THESE AND OTHER GROUPS INTERESTED IN CHILDREN AND EDUCATION INTO A FORCE STRONG ENOUGH TO OVERCOME THE FEARS OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION AND ENACT THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT.

ESEA HAD SEVERAL TITLES, OR PARTS. IT PROVIDED ASSISTANCE FOR PROGRAMS TO IMPROVE LIBRARIES, TO FUND IMAGINATIVE EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS, TO STRENGTHEN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION, AND TO FOSTER EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH.

BUT THE LARGEST PART OF THE ORIGINAL LEGISLATION, AND THE ONLY AREA WITH WHICH WE ARE CONCERNED, WAS TITLE I WHICH NOW PROVIDES OVER $2 BILLION

ANNUALLY FOR EDUCATION. THE FUNDS MUST BE USED IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH CONCENTRATIONS OF POOR CHILDREN IN ORDER TO IMPROVE THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS OFFERED TO A LIMITED NUMBER OF CHILDREN -- "EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED" CHILDREN, THAT IS, CHILDREN WHO ARE NOT DOING WELL IN SCHOOL WHETHER OR NOT THEY ARE FROM LOW-INCOME FAMILIES.

IN BRIEF, THE PROGRAM WAS DEVELOPED OUT OF A HUMANE CONCERN FOR PRECISELY THE CHILDREN IN THE WORST ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES DESCRIBED BY GLAZER AND CREEDON.

EVALUATION OF TITLE I

INCLUDED IN TITLE I WAS A REQUIREMENT THAT WAS UNIQUE AT THE TIME: A REQUIREMENT THAT PROGRAMS FUNDED WITH TITLE I BE EVALUATED ANNUALLY AT THE LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL LEVELS.

THE EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS WERE WRITTEN INTO THE ACT AT THE INSISTENCE OF SENATOR ROBERT KENNEDY. HIS MOTIVATION WAS TWO-FOLD: FIRST, A DESIRE TO INSURE THAT TITLE I FUNDS WERE EXPENDED UPON EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN IN POOR AREAS AND NOT SPENT AS GENERAL AID IN THE DISTRICTS RECEIVING FUNDS. SECOND, A HOPE THAT ENFORCING ACCOUNTABILITY UPON SCHOOL DISTRICTS WOULD RESULT IN ENHANCED ACHIEVEMENT OF TITLE I STUDENTS.

MILBREY MCLAUGHLIN HAS DONE AN EXCELLENT JOB OF DESCRIBING THE HISTORY OF EVALUATION EFFORTS IN TITLE I.[4] HER ACCOUNT TRACES THE TENSION BETWEEN THE SEVERAL SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT ABOUT THE APPROPRIATE ROLE OF EVALUATION IN A LARGE PROGRAM SUCH AS THIS -- THAT IS TO SAY DISAGREEMENTS ABOUT WHETHER EVALUATION SHOULD SERVE AS A PROGRAM MANAGEMENT DEVICE, OR AS A TOOL TO INSURE THE PROGRAM WAS IMPLEMENTED AS INTENDED BY THE LEGISLATION, OR AS AN INSTRUMENT FOR BASIC RESEARCH ON THE ACHIEVEMENT GROWTH OF DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS.

FOR THE MOST PART, EVALUATIONS OF TITLE I HAVE FOCUSED ON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF PARTICIPATING STUDENTS. HAD THOSE EVALUATIONS BEEN ABLE TO DEMONSTRATE A CONSISTENT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PRESENCE OF TITLE I FUNDS IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND INCREASED RATES OF READING ACHIEVEMENT, THE SUBSEQUENT DISPUTES ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TITLE I WOULD NEVER HAVE ARISEN. HOWEVER, EFFORTS TO DEMONSTRATE THAT RELATIONSHIP HAVE SELDOM BEEN SUCCESSFUL.

INITIALLY, HEW OFFICIALS THOUGHT THAT LOCAL EVALUATIONS COULD BE AGGREGATED AT THE STATE LEVEL, AND THAT STATE EVALUATIONS COULD BE AGGREGATED AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL IN ORDER TO DEMONSTRATE THAT TITLE I HELPED IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND HENCE DESERVED SUPPORT.

THIS APPROACH WAS UNPRODUCTIVE. MANY SCHOOL DISTRICTS DID NOT COLLECT ACHIEVEMENT DATA IN USEABLE FORM, AND, IN FACT, ONE YEAR ONLY 14 STATES PROVIDED DATA THAT COULD BE AGGREGATED UNIFORMLY.[5] AS A RESULT, LEGISLATORS AND THE PUBLIC GOT THE IMPRESSION THAT TITLE I COULD NOT BE SHOWN TO HAVE AN EFFECT UPON THE ACHIEVEMENT OF PARTICIPATING CHILDREN.

RESEARCH TURNED IN OTHER DIRECTIONS.

ONE WAS AN EFFORT TO COLLECT UNIFORM DATA THROUGH NATIONAL SURVEYS. KATHRYN HECHT HAS POINTED OUT THAT THESE NATIONAL SURVEYS WERE DESIGNED TO AVOID MANY OF THE PROBLEMS OF THE EARLIER EVALUATION EFFORTS, AND INCLUDED PLANS FOR PUPIL CENTERED INSTRUMENTS AND PROJECT DESCRIPTORS TO PROVIDE DETAILED INFORMATION ON STUDENTS SERVED AND THE PROGRAMS SERVING THEM.[6]

BUT THE DESIGN WAS NEVER FULLY IMPLEMENTED. AS A CONSEQUENCE, "ACCURATE AND DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS OF PROGRAMS WERE NOT POSSIBLE, NOR COULD THEY BE RELATED TO PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT." MOREOVER, "PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AND ITS EFFECTIVENESS WERE STILL NOT BEING MEASURED."

THE RESULT: TITLE I COULD NOT BE DEMONSTRATED TO HAVE AN EFFECT ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

A DIFFERENT EFFORT WAS INITIATED TO IDENTIFY SEVERAL SUCCESSFUL MODELS OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION WHICH COULD BE REPLICATED ELSEWHERE.

BUT WHEN, A FEW YEARS LATER, THE HEW CONTRACTOR RETURNED TO THESE MODELS, MOST OF THE SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS WERE NO LONGER FUNCTIONING FOR ONE REASON OR ANOTHER.7

BY NOW MY THEME SHOULD BE FAMILIAR: RESEARCHERS ANXIOUSLY SEARCHING FOR EVIDENCE TO DEMONSTRATE THAT TITLE I WAS EFFECTIVE IN RAISING ACHIEVEMENT WERE THWARTED BY THE INTRINSIC DIFFICULTY OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM. THEY BEGAN HOPING TO JUSTIFY THE PROGRAM'S EXISTENCE BY SHOWING THAT IT RAISED STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT. THEIR RESULTS WERE INCONCLUSIVE, BUT DESPITE RESEARCHERS' CAUTIONS ABOUT HOW THEIR RESULTS SHOULD BE INTERPRETED, THE PRESS CONSISTENTLY REPORTED THAT "COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS FAIL," OR "TITLE I DOES NOT WORK" OR ANOTHER PITHY SUMMARY THAT MET THE AVAILABLE SPACE.

CONGRESSIONAL REACTION

THE REACTION OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES TO THESE EVALUATION RESULTS WAS PERHAPS PREDICTABLE: EXTREME DISSATISFACTION.

CLEARLY, IF THE EVALUATIONS HAD FOUND THAT TITLE I MONEY LED TO SPECTACULAR INCREASES IN STUDENTS' READING ACHIEVEMENT, CONGRESS WOULD HAVE NOT HAVE BEEN UNHAPPY. BUT CONGRESSIONAL EXPERTS ON EDUCATION WHO SUPPORTED THE TITLE I CONCEPT WERE CONFRONTED WITH THE FACT THAT TITLE I COULD NOT BE SHOWN TO RAISE THE READING ACHIEVEMENT LEVEL OF THE AVERAGE TITLE I STUDENT IN THE AVERAGE SCHOOL DISTRICT. AND THIS EVIDENCE WAS BEING INTERPRETED BY RESEARCHERS AND THE PRESS AS PROVING THAT TITLE I DID NOT WORK, AND, PERHAPS, COULD NOT WORK.

CONGRESSIONAL EXPERTS WERE NOT PREPARED TO ACCEPT THESE EVALUATIONS AS VALID FOR SEVERAL REASONS. FIRST, BECAUSE THE EVALUATIONS FOCUSED UPON ONE

OUTCOME TO THE EXCLUSION OF OTHERS. SECOND, BECAUSE CONGRESSMEN SENSED THAT TITLE I IN OPERATION WAS A COMPLICATED PROGRAM WHOSE EFFECTS ON CHILDREN AND ON THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM COULD NOT BE NEATLY SUMMARIZED IN SIMPLE ACCOUNTS OF STUDENT READING ACHIEVEMENT GAINS, AND THIRDLY, BECAUSE THE EVALUATIONS SENT TO CAPITOL HILL PROVIDED VERY LITTLE USEFUL INFORMATION WHICH THEY COULD USE TO IMPROVE THE PROGRAM.

LET ME SAY A WORD ABOUT EACH OF THESE CONCERNS.

FIRST, PRIOR EVALUATIONS TYPICALLY FOCUSED UPON ONE POSSIBLE OUTCOME OF TITLE I PROGRAMS: THE EFFECT ON CHILDREN'S READING AND MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT.

ALTHOUGH STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT WAS CLEARLY AN IMPORTANT PURPOSE OF THE STATUTE, CONGRESS HAD OTHER GOALS IN MIND, AS WELL, IN ESTABLIHSING THE TITLE I PROGRAM.

THIS IS NOT A STARTLING REVELATION NEW TO US -- AS LONG AGO AS 1970, DAVID COHEN WAS SAYING THE SAME THING.[8] MR. COHEN SAID:

> "IT IS...DIFFICULT TO CONCLUDE THAT IMPROVING SCHOOLS PRODUCTION OF POOR CHILDREN'S ACHIEVEMENT WAS THE LEGISLATION'S MAJOR PURPOSE. THE LEGISLATIVE INTENT EMBRACED MANY OTHER ELEMENTS: IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL SERVICES IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH MANY POOR CHILDREN, PROVIDING FISCAL RELIEF FOR THE CENTRAL CITIES AND PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS, REDUCING DISCONTENT AND CONFLICT ABOUT RACE AND POVERTY, AND ESTABLISHING THE PRINCIPAL OF FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR LOCAL SCHOOL PROBLEMS. THE FACT THAT THESE WERE EMBODIED IN A SINGLE PIECE OF LEGISLATION CONTRIBUTED HEAVILY TO ITS PASSAGE, BUT IT ALSO MEANT THAT THE RESULTING PROGRAM WAS NOT SINGLE-PURPOSE OR HOMOGENEOUS. IF ANY SUPPOSITION IS IN ORDER, IT IS PRECISELY THE OPPOSITE."

AND, HE ADDED:

> "THE MAIN POINT...IS THAT THE PURPOSES OF THE LEGISLATION WERE MUCH MORE COMPLEX; MOST OF THEM COULD BE SATISFIED WITHOUT ANY EVIDENCE ABOUT CHILDREN'S ACHIEVEMENT."

SECOND, CONGRESS APPEARED CONVINCED THAT THE COMPLEXITY OF PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER TITLE I DID NOT READILY LEND THEMSELVES TO SUMMARY MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

THE 1974 HOUSE REPORT, FOR EXAMPLE, REJECTED THE CRITERION FOR EFFECTIVENESS USED IN SEVERAL TITLE I EVALUATIONS.[9] THE REPORT STATED:

> "REGRETFULLY, THERE ARE FEW EVALUATION REPORTS WHICH CAN SHOW SCIENTIFICALLY THE SUCCESS OF TITLE I ON A NATIONAL LEVEL; BUT THAT FAILURE IS NOT SO MUCH A FAILURE OF THE PROGRAM AS IT IS A FAILURE TO UNDERSTAND THE NATURE OF THE PROGRAM...
>
> TITLE I PROVIDES DIRECT AID TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO USE AS THEY SEE FIT TO IMPROVE THE EDUCATION OF EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN. MANY SCHOOL DISTRICTS... HAVE DECIDED THAT IT IS MORE IMPORTANT TO USE SUBSTANTIAL AMOUNTS OF MONEY TO MEET THE HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL NEEDS OF THEIR STUDENTS THAN TO CONCENTRATE SOLELY ON REMEDIAL READING AND MATHEMATICS. THEREFORE, TO JUDGE THOSE PROGRAMS ACCORDING TO THE SOLE CRITERION OF READING ACHIEVEMENT IS AN INVALID EVALUATION OF THEIR EFFECTIVENESS.

A 1971 URBAN INSTITUTE DISCUSSION OF EVALUATION APTLY SUMMARIZES THE DIVERSITY OF PROJECTS FUNDED WITH TITLE I[10]:

> AT THE LOCAL PROJECT LEVEL, WHERE ALL EVALUATIONS MUST START, TITLE I FUNDS CAN BE USED TO FINANCE A BROAD RANGE OF ACTIVITIES FROM PRESCHOOL THROUGH HIGH SCHOOL. INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS MAY DIFFER IN ALMOST EVERY DIMENSION. LEVELS OF FUNDING VARY FROM A FEW DOLLARS TO SEVERAL HUNDRED DOLLARS PER CHILD -- BUT THE TITLE I EXPENDITURES ARE ORDINARILY RELATIVELY MERGER COMPARED TO REGULAR EXPENDITURES FROM STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS. THESE ARE BUT A FEW OF THE PROBLEMS WHICH CONFRONT THOSE WHO ATTEMPT TO EVALUATE TITLE I PROJECTS.

AS IF TO CONFIRM CONGRESSIONAL SUSPICIONS OF THE VALIDITY OF EVALUATIONS BASED SOLELY ON ACHIEVEMENT GAINS, A 1969 REPORT ON TITLE I IN 28 DISTRICTS FOUND THAT FUNDS WERE NOT BEING SPENT ON THE MAJORITY OF ELIGIBLE CHILDREN, WERE NOT BEING CONCENTRATED SUFFICIENTLY, AND WERE PURCHASING EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES AND NOT EDUCATIONAL SERVICES. THE

REPORT WAS PREPARED BY THE CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND AND THE NAACP.[11]

PREDICTABLY, THE RESULTS OF THIS REPORT REINFORCED THE PUBLIC CONSCIOUSNESS THAT TITLE I FAILED, BUT CONCERNED CONGRESSMEN WERE MORE LIKELY TO CONCLUDE THAT EARLIER EVALUATIONS WERE WORTHLESS BECAUSE THEY MEASURED OUTCOMES OF SERVICES THAT WERE NOT BEING DELIVERED. IN OTHER WORDS, OTHER EVALUATIONS SEEMED TO IMPLY THAT COMPENSATORY EDUCATION DID NOT AND PERHAPS WOULD NOT WORK. THE 1969 REPORT IMPLIED THAT COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS WERE NOT IMPLEMENTED AS INTENDED AND HENCE IT WAS THOUGHT VERY USEFUL FOR CONGRESSIONAL PURPOSES. LIKE CHRISTIANITY, TO ABUSE SHAW'S FAMOUS APHORISM, TITLE I HAD NOT BEEN TRIED.

WHICH BRINGS ME TO MY FINAL POINT, NAMELY THAT THE INFORMATION PRESENTED IN PRIOR EVALUATIONS PROVIDED LITTLE HELPFUL INFORMATION FOR CONGRESSIONAL DECISION-MAKING PURPOSES.

THE TITLE I PROGRAM, TO SUMMARIZE MY EARLIER COMMENTS, WAS PART OF A COMPLEX FEDERAL RESPONSE TO A DIVERSE SET OF POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, EDUCATIONAL AND PUBLIC POLICY PROBLEMS. IT INCLUDED A CORRECTIVE MECHANISM -- EVALUATION -- SO THAT ADJUSTMENTS COULD BE MADE AS THE PROGRAM DEVELOPED.

BUT THE EVALUATIONS FUNDED AS A RESULT OF THIS CORRECTIVE MECHANISM HAVE NOT MET CONGRESSIONAL NEEDS, FOR AT LEAST TWO REASONS.

THEY HAVE FOCUSED UPON ONLY ONE OF THE CONCERNS THAT PROMPTED ENACTMENT OF THE PROGRAM, NAMELY THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES, AND WITHIN THAT AREA PRINCIPALLY UPON CHANGES IN STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

AND, SECONDLY, THEIR RESULTS HAVE BEEN INTERPRETED IN SUCH A WAY AS TO ANSWER THE QUESTION OF WHETHER OR NOT TITLE I SHOULD BE CONTINUED, AND NOT HOW IT MIGHT BE IMPROVED.

THESE FACTORS LEAD ME TO THE CONCLUSION THAT THE EVALUATION PROCESS HAS NOT BEEN NEUTRAL AND, IN FACT, HAS HURT THE TITLE I EFFORT IN AT LEAST ONE IMPORTANT RESPECT: THE OUTCOMES THAT RESEARCHERS CAN MEASURE CONVENIENTLY, NAMELY, ACHIEVEMENT, HAVE COME TO BE PERCEIVED AS THE SOLE PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM.

AS A RESULT, EVALUATIONS DESIGNED WITH THE BEST OF INTENTIONS TO HELP IMPROVE THE PROGRAM WERE, IN TRUTH, BIASED AGAINST IT IN THAT THEY EMBARASSED ITS ADVOCATES AND SUPPORTED THOSE WHO OPPOSED IT.

"EMBARASSED" MAY APPEAR TO BE A PECULIAR TERM IN THIS CONTEXT; NEVERTHELESS IT APPEARS APPROPRIATE. IT IS APPROPRIATE BECAUSE EVALUATION UNFAIRLY FORCED TITLE I ADVOCATES TO DEFEND THE PROGRAM AS THOUGH ITS SOLE PURPOSE WAS THE ENHANCEMENT OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT. CONGRESS, AS COHEN POINTED OUT, CLEARLY HAD OTHER PURPOSES IN MIND AS WELL, AND THESE PURPOSES WERE SLIGHTED BY THE ATTEMPT TO CONCENTRATE SOLELY ON ACHIEVEMENT.

MORE TO THE POINT, EARLY EVALUATIONS ATTEMPTED TO SAY SOMETHING ABOUT ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOMES WITHOUT DOCUMENTING THE EXISTENCE OF SPECIAL SERVICES OR, IN FACT, THE PARTICIPATION OF THE STUDENTS BEING ASSESSED. EVEN IF CONGRESS WERE TO AGREE THAT INCREASING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT WAS THE SOLE PURPOSE OF TITLE I, EVALUATIONS WHICH IGNORE THE REALITIES OF HOW SUCH A PROGRAM IS IMPLEMENTED RUN THE RISK OF SERIOUSLY MISREPRESENTING THE POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THAT GOAL OF ADEQUATELY FUNDED AND WELL MANAGED EDUCATIONAL SERVICES.

IN SPITE OF THE RESEARCHERS' CAUTIONS REGARDING THE MEANING OF THE RESULTS OF ACHIEVEMENT BASED EVALUATIONS OF TITLE I, MANY PEOPLE CONCLUDED FROM THE RESULTS THAT COMPENSATORY EDUCATION DID NOT WORK. OTHERS WENT FURTHER AND DECIDED THAT COMPENSATORY EDUCATION COULD NOT WORK.

THIS IS NOT TO SAY THAT THE HISTORY OF TITLE I EVALUATION IS NOT UNDERSTANDABLE GIVEN THE INITIAL OPTIMISM ABOUT WHAT IT MIGHT BE ABLE TO ACCOMPLISH.

IT IS UNDERSTANDABLE, ALSO, THAT SOCIAL SCIENTISTS ARE TRAINED TO AVOID AMBIGUITY IN FAVOR OF SINGLE EASILY-MEASURED OBJECTIVES -- IN THIS CASE THE MOST CONVENIENT IS STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT GROWTH.

HOWEVER, LEGISLATORS CAN LIVE QUITE COMFORTABLY WITH AMBIGUITY OF PURPOSES. TO ENACT PROGRAMS LIKE TITLE I, LEGISLATORS MUST BUILD COALITIONS OF DIVERSE GROUPS AND INTERESTS; SUCH COALITIONS ARE POSSIBLE ONLY IF THE PROGRAM'S PURPOSES ARE DIVERSE AND IF CONTROVERSIAL QUESTIONS ARE RESOLVED AMBIGUOUSLY.

THE TASK OF THE EVALUATOR, FACED WITH THE AMBIGUITY OF LEGISLATION, IS TO LIVE WITH THE FACT THAT PROGRAMS HAVE DIVERSE OBJECTIVES, AND NOT AS HAS BEEN THE CASE IN THE PAST, TO FORCE-FIT A COMPLEX PROBLEM INTO AN OVER-SIMPLIFIED ANALYTICAL MODEL.

THOSE OF US IN GOVERNMENT AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR HAVE LEARNED A GREAT DEAL FROM TITLE I'S EVALUATION HISTORY. OUR OWN WORK REFLECTS OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE NEED TO DOCUMENT THE NATURE OF THE PROGRAM IN OPERATION IN TERMS OF THE SERVICES PROVIDED AND THE PARTICIPATION OF STUDENTS. THE TWO MOST RECENT STUDIES FUNDED BY THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION'S OFFICE OF PLANNING, BUDGETING, AND EVALUATION ARE BASED ON SIMILAR LOGIC; THE TWO STUDIES ARE AN EVALUATION OF READING OUTCOMES IN TITLE I PROGRAMS, AND AN EVALUATION OF THE SUSTAINING EFFECTS OF TITLE I.

TO AVOID THE BIAS INVOLVED IN FOCUSING EVALUATION ON ONLY ONE ASPECT OF A PROGRAM, RESEARCHERS MUST FIRST CONSIDER WHAT TITLE I OR OTHER COMPENSATORY

EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE IN PRACTICE; THAT IS, HOW FUNDS ARE DISTRIBUTED, PROGRAMS MANAGED, AND STUDENTS AND SERVICES SELECTED. WITH THIS INFORMATION, IT IS POSSIBLE TO IDENTIFY THE RANGE OF OUTCOMES THAT TITLE I IS BEING IMPLEMENTED TO PRODUCE, AND THUS TO PLAN EVALUATIONS THAT GIVE A BALANCED OVERALL PICTURE OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS.

NIE EVALUATION

AS A RESULT OF CONGRESSIONAL DISSATISFACTION WITH PRIOR EVALUATIONS, AND AS A RESULT OF CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST IN THE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZING TITLE I DIFFERENTLY, SECTION 821 OF THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1974 REQUESTED NIE TO STUDY COMPENSATORY EDUCATION.

WE WERE ASKED TO:

- EXAMINE THE FUNDAMENTAL PURPOSES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS
- ANALYZE THE WAYS OF IDENTIFYING CHILDREN IN GREATEST NEED OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

- CONSIDER ALTERNATIVE WAYS OF MEETING THESE CHILDREN'S NEEDS
- CONSIDER THE FEASIBILITY, COSTS, AND CONSEQUENCES OF ALTERNATIVE MEANS OF DISTRIBUTING FEDERAL COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FUNDS.

IN A WORD, THIS MANDATE PUT US IN THE POSITION OF BEING A CONTRACTOR, WITH CONGRESS AS OUR SOLE CLIENT. WE WERE REQUESTED TO SUBMIT A PROPOSAL TO CONGRESS FOR APPROVAL; FUNDS FOR THE STUDY WERE SPECIALLY SET ASIDE BY CONGRESS; AND OUR REPORTS GO DIRECTLY TO CONGRESS, WITHOUT CLEARANCE OR FORMAL REVIEW BY ANY OTHER AGENCY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

CLEARLY, CONGRESSIONAL NEEDS FOR INFORMATION ARE PARAMOUNT AND DRIVE THE RESEARCH, NOT OUR NEEDS OR OUR PREFERENCES.

ESSENTIALLY SECTION 821 CAN BE CONCEIVED OF AS TWO MAJOR REQUESTS FROM CONGRESS.

THE FIRST REQUIRES US TO ASSESS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN MEETING THEIR FUNDAMENTAL PURPOSES.

THE SECOND CHARGES US WITH AN EXAMINATION OF ALTERNATIVE METHODS BY WHICH THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION MIGHT BE IMPROVED.

THE INTERIM REPORT WHICH WE SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS LAST DECEMBER DEFINED THE FUNDAMENTAL PURPOSES OF TITLE I AND HOW WE PROPOSE TO EXAMINE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAM IN ATTAINING THOSE PURPOSES AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF POSSIBLE CHANGES.

OTHERS HERE WILL DISCUSS HOW WE ARE LOOKING AT EACH OF THE PURPOSES OF TITLE I. MY PURPOSE IS TO EXPLAIN WHAT THOSE PURPOSES ARE, AND TO LAY OUT THE GENERAL STRATEGY OF RESEARCH BY WHICH WE EXAMINE THEM.

FUNDAMENTAL PURPOSES

To examine the fundamental purposes of compensatory education programs, one must distinguish the broad philosophical concerns that may have motivated the program's originators from the more concrete operational purposes that are built into the program.

The originators of such compensatory education programs as Title I may have had in mind some very general purposes, including helping to eliminate poverty; contributing to the redistribution of wealth and opportunity; reforming education; and symbolizing society's commitment to helping the disadvantaged.[12] Although it is possible to speculate about what the basic objectives might be, the debates, statutes, and official legislative reports that established the program contain a specific set of fundamental purposes.

Financial Assistance is clearly one of them. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was formally entitled "An Act to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools." It thus was a cornerstone of an emerging Federal interest in equality of educational opportunity. Enactment of the ESEA was the culmination of decades of conflict concerning whether the Federal Government should provide aid to elementary and secondary schools and whether students in private schools should benefit. The Act established the Federal interest in elementary and secondary education and clearly included private school students among its beneficiaries.

Section 101 of Title I, entitled "Declaration of Policy," is a statement of the program's funding objectives. Section 101 states:

> In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families, and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate

> EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, THE CONGRESS HEREBY DECLARES IT TO BE THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ...TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES SERVING AREAS WITH CONCENTRATIONS OF CHILDREN FROM LOW-INCOME FAMILIES...

THE 1965 HOUSE REPORT ACCOMPANYING THIS LEGISLATION REFERRED TO THE VIEW OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR THAT "AID TO THE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILD REPRESENTS THE BASIC APPROACH TO WIDESPREAD EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT IN THIS COUNTRY."[13] TITLE I, THE LARGEST OF THE ESEA PROGRAMS, THEREFORE, WAS INTENDED TO BE THE PRINCIPAL FEDERAL METHOD FOR IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHILDREN IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS SERVING AREAS WITH LARGE NUMBERS OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE'S REPORT ACCOMPANYING THE 1974 EDUCATION AMENDMENTS REITERATED THAT "A PRINCIPAL MOTIVATION...WAS THE DESIRE TO DISTRIBUTE SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS EXPERIENCING DIFFICULTY IN FUNDING ADEQUATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS DUE TO 'CONCENTRATIONS OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES'." THE REPORT ALSO SPOKE OF A "NEW NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO UPGRADING THE EDUCATION OF THE POOR...."[14] HOWEVER, IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT THE MANDATE FOR THIS STUDY IS ITSELF EVIDENCE THAT CONGRESS HAS CONSIDERED REFORMULATING ITS FUNDING OBJECTIVES TO DIRECT FUNDS TO LEAS AND SCHOOLS ON THE BASIS OF THE NUMBERS OF LOW-ACHIEVING STUDENTS.

FROM THE DECLARATION OF POLICY AND SUBSEQUENT FORMAL CONGRESSIONAL STATEMENTS EMERGES THE FIRST FUNDAMENTAL PURPOSE OF TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT: <u>TO PROVIDE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN RELATION TO THEIR NUMBERS OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN AND WITHIN THOSE DISTRICTS TO THE SCHOOLS WITH THE GREATEST NUMBERS OF LOW-INCOME STUDENTS</u>.

WERE THE PROVISION OF THIS ASSISTANCE THE ONLY PURPOSE OF TITLE I, EVALUATION WOULD SIMPLY REQUIRE AN ACCOUNTING OF ITS EFFECTS ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS. AS THE LEGISLATION MAKES CLEAR, HOWEVER, DISTRICTS RECEIVING TITLE I ASSISTANCE ARE OBLIGATED TO SPEND IT IN CERTAIN WAYS, AND

THESE REQUIREMENTS IMPLY THE EXISTENCE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDAMENTAL PURPOSES FOR TITLE I.

PROVIDING EDUCATIONAL SERVICES APPEARS TO BE THE NEXT PURPOSE.

THE DECLARATION OF POLICY ALSO STATES THAT LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES ARE REQUIRED TO USE TITLE I FUNDS "TO EXPAND AND IMPROVE THEIR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS BY VARIOUS MEANS...WHICH CONTRIBUTE PARTICULARLY TO MEETING THE SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVE CHILDREN." ALTHOUGH THE CONGRESSIONAL ORIGINATORS OF TITLE I MAY HAVE DIFFERED ABOUT THE DEGREE TO WHICH SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD BE RESTRICTED IN THEIR USE OF FUNDS, CONGRESS CLEARLY INTENDED THAT FUNDS BE USED FOR PROGRAMS TARGETED ON CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS. THE EXACT NATURE OF THE SERVICES WAS LEFT TO THE JUDGMENT OF LOCAL EDUCATORS.

SECTION 141 OF TITLE I EXPANDS UPON THE GENERAL INSTRUCTION CITED IN THE DECLARATION OF POLICY AND MAKES SCHOOL DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY FOR TITLE I GRANTS CONTINGENT UPON ASSURANCES THAT FUNDS WOULD BE USED FOR PROGRAMS: (1) DESIGNED TO MEET THE "SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN IN SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREAS HAVING HIGH CONCENTRATIONS" OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN; AND (2) OF "SUFFICIENT SIZE, SCOPE, AND QUALITY TO GIVE REASONABLE PROMISE OF SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING THOSE NEEDS."

IN ADDITION, THE SAME SECTION REQUIRES ASSURANCES THAT TITLE I FUNDING SUPPLEMENT RATHER THAN SUPPLANT NON-FEDERAL FUNDING AVAILABLE FOR TITLE I STUDENTS, AND "TO THE EXTENT PRACTICAL, INCREASE THE LEVEL OF FUNDS THAT WOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR THE EDUCATION OF PUPILS PARTICIPATING" IF FEDERAL FUNDS WERE NOT AVAILABLE.

BASES ON THE CONSISTENT AND RECURRING INTENT OF CONGRESS FROM 1965 TO 1974, THE SECOND FUNDAMENTAL PURPOSE OF TITLE I IS: TO FUND

SPECIAL SERVICES FOR LOW-ACHIEVING CHILDREN IN THE POOREST SCHOOLS.

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT IS THE LAST OF THE PURPOSES I WANT TO MENTION. CONGRESS DID NOT SPECIFY THE EXACT NATURE OF THE SERVICES TO BE DELIVERED UNDER TITLE I, NOR DID IT PRECISELY DEFINE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN.[15] HOWEVER, IT SEEMS CLEAR THAT CONGRESS WAS CONCERNED WITH THE CONNECTION BETWEEN POVERTY AND LOW ACHIEVEMENT AND HOPED THAT THE PROVISION OF TITLE I SERVICES IN AREAS WITH CONCENTRATIONS OF POVERTY MIGHT HELP IMPROVE THE SCHOOL PERFORMANCE OF CHILDREN IN POOR AREAS.

THE 1965 HOUSE REPORT ACCOMPANYING ESEA SPOKE OF THE "CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONDITION OF POVERTY...AND POOR ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE."[16] MOREOVER, MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMENTED IN 1974 THAT COMPARED TO THE FUNDS ALLOCATION PURPOSES OF TITLE I, "THE EDUCATIONAL RESULTS THAT ARE ACHIEVED ONCE THIS AID REACHES SCHOOL DISTRICTS," ARE THE "MORE IMPORTANT AND MORE FREQUENTLY DISCUSSED FACET OF THE PROGRAM."[17] NEVERTHELESS, THE COMMITTEE STRESSED THAT TITLE I IS NOT SOLELY A PROGRAM TO ENHANCE BASIC SKILLS IN READING AND MATHEMATICS.

IN THE SENATE, THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE COMMENTED UPON THE SAME SUBJECT IN DISCUSSING WHY THE COMMITTEE REJECTED A PROPOSAL TO CONCENTRATE 75% OF TITLE I FUNDS ON READING AND MATHEMATICS. THE 1974 SENATE REPORT NOTED:[18]

> ...LOCAL OFFICIALS ARE CHARGED WITH DEVELOPING LOCAL SOLUTIONS TO MEET THEIR SPECIFIC NEEDS. OFTEN THE SOLUTIONS INVOLVE REMEDIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE BASIC SKILLS. BUT MANY LOCAL OFFICIALS HAVE FOUND THAT THEIR CHILDREN'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS ALSO DEPENDS ON PROVISION OF AUXILIARY SERVICES SUCH AS GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING PROGRAMS OR CULTURAL ENRICHMENT. TITLE I IS NOT BASICALLY A SOCIAL SERVICES PROGRAM; HOWEVER, SUCH SOCIAL SERVICES ARE NECESSARY IF EDUCATION IS TO TAKE PLACE.

PERHAPS THE MOST USEFUL BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE USES OF TITLE I FUNDS

FOUND ACCEPTABLE BY CONGRESS CAN BE FOUND IN THE SAME SENATE REPORT. IT SAID: "IN APPROPRIATE CIRCUMSTANCES, TITLE I FUNDS MAY EVEN BE USED FOR AUXILIARY SERVICES, SUCH AS FOOD, MEDICAL OR DENTAL SERVICES, AND CLOTHING, BUT THE EMPHASIS IS ON EDUCATION."

HENCE, THE THIRD FUNDAMENTAL PURPOSE IS CLEARLY ESTABLISHED IN CONGRESSIONAL INTENT: To contribute to the cognitive, emotional, social, or physical development of participating students.

THESE THREE FUNDAMENTAL PURPOSES OF TITLE I ARE CONSISTENT WITH ONE ANOTHER, BUT THAT IS NOT TO SAY THAT EACH IS EQUALLY IMPORTANT TO EVERY MEMBER OF CONGRESS. CONGRESSIONAL DEBATES, AND EVEN THE LANGUAGE OF DIFFERENT PARTS OF COMMITTEE AND CONFERENCE REPORTS, SUGGEST THAT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS DIFFER OVER THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE SEVERAL PURPOSES.

ALTHOUGH SOME CONGRESSIONAL STATEMENTS IMPLY THAT THE PURPOSES FORM A HIERARCHY IN WHICH TITLE I DELIVERS FUNDS AND SERVICES ONLY TO INCREASE CHILDREN'S ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- THUS MAKING THE THIRD PURPOSE THE MOST IMPORTANT -- OTHER STATEMENTS MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS AND DELIVERY OF SERVICES ARE IMPORTANT ENDS IN THEMSELVES.

EVALUATION AND POLICY

AS I HOPE I HAVE MADE PLAIN, EVALUATION OF TITLE I MUST START FROM THE RECOGNITION THAT THE PROGRAM HAS SEVERAL PURPOSES, AND TO FOCUS EXCLUSIVELY ON ONE IMPROPERLY IGNORES THE OTHERS. WE HAVE, THEREFORE, INITIATED SEVERAL INVESTIGATIONS INTO EACH OF THE AREAS JUST DESCRIBED.

IN ADDITION, EVALUATION MUST ACKNOWLEDGE THAT TITLE I OPERATES THROUGH THE FEDERAL SYSTEM, AND THAT STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS DETERMINE WHAT IT WILL BE IN PRACTICE BY DELIVERING THE SERVICES THEIR OWN STUDENTS NEED.

ALTHOUGH THERE IS ONLY ONE FEDERAL TITLE I PROGRAM, I.E., ONLY ONE

BASIC FRAMEWORK OF LAWS AND POLICIES, IT OPERATES DIFFERENTLY IN EVERY STATE, IN 14,000 SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND IN COUNTLESS CLASSROOMS.

THUS TO UNDERSTAND AND EVALUATE TITLE I IT IS NECESSARY TO CONSIDER THE WAYS IN WHICH FEDERAL POLICY INTERACTS WITH THE ACTIONS OF STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES THAT ACTUALLY IMPLEMENT THE PROGRAM. WE HAVE, THEREFORE, DEVOTED CONSIDERABLE ATTENTION TO A FOURTH MAJOR SUBJECT: THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM.

THIS STRATEGY FOR EXAMINING COMPENSATORY EDUCATION CAN BE VIEWED AS AN EFFORT TO RESTORE EVALUATION TO ITS PROPER ROLE AS A NEUTRAL ELEMENT IN THE POLICYMAKING PROCESS.

THE ATTEMPT IS BASED ON THE RECOGNITION THAT STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IS BUT ONE OF THE ELEMENTS IN WHICH CONGRESS IS INTERESTED, AND THAT SOCIAL SCIENTISTS SERIOUSLY MISREPRESENT THE PURPOSES OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS IF THEY CONCENTRATE ON ONLY ONE MEASURABLE OUTCOME.

MOREOVER, SINCE THE CONGRESSIONAL CLIENT DISPLAYS LITTLE INCLINATION TO DELEGATE JUDGMENTS ABOUT WHETHER TO CONTINUE TITLE I TO SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND REPORTERS, WE MAKE NO ATTEMPT TO SET OURSELVES UP AS FINAL ARBITERS OF THE PROGRAM.

IN OTHER WORDS, IT IS CLEAR THAT THE FUTURE OF TITLE I WILL BE DETERMINED BY A VARIETY OF EDUCATIONAL, POLITICAL, SOCIAL, AND ECONOMIC FACTORS WHICH CONGRESS MUST CONSIDER, AND NOT BY EVALUATION RESULTS ALONE.

HENCE, OUR JOB IS TO PROVIDE CONGRESS, WHICH IS FAR REMOVED FROM ACTUAL LOCAL PROGRAMS, WITH AN ACCURATE UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THE PROGRAM IS IN OPERATION AS WELL AS OF WHAT IT MIGHT BE.

TO CONCLUDE, THE NIE STUDY OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION IS NOT AIMED AT PROVIDING EVIDENCE ON WHETHER OR NOT TITLE I HAS JUSTIFIED ITS EXISTENCE.

INSTEAD, IT WILL HELP MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THEIR STAFFS ANSWER TWO RATHER DIFFERENT QUESTIONS.

FIRST, IF THERE IS TO BE A FEDERAL PROGRAM ADDRESSING EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS IN POOR AREAS, WHAT IS THE BEST WAY TO DESIGN IT IN TERMS OF FUNDS DISTRIBUTION, MANAGEMENT, AND SERVICE DELIVERY?

SECOND, HOW CAN LOCAL PEOPLE MOST EFFECTIVELY USE THE FEDERAL PROGRAM TO GUARANTEE THAT IT HAS THE BEST POSSIBLE IMPACT ON THE GROWTH AND WELFARE OF THE CHILDREN IT IS INTENDED TO SERVE?

REFERENCES

1 See, for example, Bailey, Stephen K., "The Office of Education and the Education Act of 1965." (Inter-University Case Program Series, No. 1001.) New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1966; Bailey, Stephen K., and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968; Eidenberg, Eugene, and Roy D. Morey, An Act of Congress: The Legislative Process and the Making of Education Policy. New York: W. W. Morton & Co., 1969; Meranto, Philip, The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965: A Study in Political Innovation. (Education in Large Cities Series.) Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967; and Price, Hugh Douglas, "Race, Religion, and the Rules Committee: The Kennedy Aid-to-Education Bills," in The Uses of Power: Seven Cases in American Politics. (Westin, Alan F. (ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962.

2 Harrington, Michael, The Other America: Poverty in the United States. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1964.

3 Glazer, Nona Y., and Carol F. Creedon (eds), Children and Poverty: Some Sociological and Psychological Perspectives. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co., 1968.

4 McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin, Evaluation and Reform: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1975.

5 Evaluating Compensatory Education: An Interim Report on the NIE Compensatory Education Study. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, December 30, 1976.

6 Hecht, Kathryn A., "Title I Federal Evaluation: The First Five Years," Teachers College Record (Vol. 75, No. 1). Sept. 1973; pp. 67-78.

7 See McLaughlin, op. cit., p. 88.

8 Cohen, David K., "Politics and Research: Evaluation of Social Action Programs in Education," Review of Educational Research (Vol. 40, No. 2). April, 1970; pp. 213-238.

9 U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Education and Labor, Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1974: Report to Accompany H.R. 69, 93rd Congress, 2nd Sess., 21 February, 1974, H.R. 93-805.

10 Wholey, Joseph S., et. al., Title I Evaluation and Technical Assistance: Assessment and Prospects. Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute, February, 1971.

11 Martin, Ruby, and Phyllis McClure, Title I of ESEA: Is It Helping Poor Children? Washington: Washington Research Project of the Southern Center for Studies in Public Policy and the National Association for Colored People Legal Defense and Educational Fund, 1970.

REFERENCES (CONTINUED)

12 COMPENSATORY EDUCATION INCLUDES A NUMBER OF FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS IN ADDITION TO ESEA TITLE I. THE NIE STUDY EXAMINES THESE OTHER PROGRAMS, BUT CONCENTRATES ON TITLE I IN ORDER TO INSURE ADEQUATE DEPTH FOR THE STUDY.

13 U. S., CONGRESS, HOUSE, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965: REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 2362, 89TH CONG., 1ST SESS., 8 MARCH, 1965, H. REPT. 143.

14 U. S., CONGRESS, HOUSE, 93RD CONGRESS, H. R. 93-805, SUPRA.

15 IN 1974 SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSES OF A SPECIAL STUDY TO COUNT NUMBERS OF LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS, AS WELL AS LOW-INCOME STUDENTS, PARTICIPATING IN TITLE I PROJECTS DID CONGRESS DEFINE "EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN." THE DEFINITION: "CHILDREN WHO ARE ACHIEVING ONE OR MORE YEARS BEHIND THE ACHIEVEMENT EXPECTED AT THE APPROPRIATE GRADE LEVEL FOR SUCH CHILDREN."

16 U. S., CONGRESS, HOUSE 89TH CONGRESS, H. REPORT 143, SUPRA.

17 IBID.

18 U. S., CONGRESS, SENATE, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1974: REPORT ON S-1539, 93RD CONG., 2ND SESS., 29 MARCH 1974, S. REPORT 93-763.